

Appl. No. 10/849,954
Paper dated December 22, 2005
Reply to Office Action dated November 15, 2005

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-13 were pending. At the outset, the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 5, 7, 9, and 11 is acknowledged with appreciation. By this paper, claims 2-6, 8 and 12 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, claims 1 and 13 are amended to incorporate the elements of allowable claim 5, and allowable claims 7, 9 and 11 are amended into independent form. Accordingly, the rejections of claims 1-4, 6, 8, 10, and 12-13 are moot, and claims 1, 7, 9-11 and 13 are respectfully asserted to be in condition for allowance.

New dependent claims 14-16 are added, which recite "memory means for storing the event history information of the print head; wherein the modifying means changes, according to the event history information stored in the memory means, the number of ink droplets to be ejected by the preliminary ejection means following the wiping operation of the wiping means." Support for these claims is found throughout the application as original filed, including original claim 10. No new matter will be added to this application by entry of these claims. Entry is requested. These claims are dependent from claims 7, 9 and 11, respectively and are allowable for at least similar reasons.

New independent claims 17-19 are added, which are directed to print head recovery methods. Support for these claims is found throughout the application as original filed, including original claims 7, 9, 11 and 13. No new matter will be added to this application by entry of these claims. Entry is requested. These claims are allowable for at least similar reasons that claims 7, 9 and 11 have been found to be allowable.

Appl. No. 10/849,954
Paper dated December 22, 2005
Reply to Office Action dated November 15, 2005

One formal matter was raised in the office action that bears comment. The office action indicates that a priority document was not received by the USPTO. According to applicants' records, such document was submitted in July 2004. A review of the PAIR records, finds that the cover page of that document was scanned, and an "artifact" sheet inserted indicating that a document could not be scanned. [Copies attached]. Applicant believes the document that the USPTO was unable to scan was the foreign priority document. The examiner is requested attempt to locate the document associated with the artifact sheet.

CONCLUSION

For the above-stated reasons, this application is respectfully asserted to be in condition for allowance. An early and favorable examination on the merits is requested. In the event that a telephone conference would facilitate the examination of this application in any way, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number provided.

THE COMMISSIONER IS HEREBY AUTHORIZED TO CHARGE ANY ADDITIONAL FEES WHICH MAY BE REQUIRED FOR THE TIMELY CONSIDERATION OF THIS AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 AND 1.17, OR CREDIT ANY OVERPAYMENT TO DEPOSIT ACCOUNT NO. 13-4500, ORDER NO. 1232-5421.

Respectfully submitted,
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: December 22, 2005

By: 

Matthew K. Blackburn
Registration No. 47,428

Correspondence Address:

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
3 World Financial Center
New York, NY 10281-2101
(212) 415-8700 Telephone
(212) 415-8701 Facsimile